

### **REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1, 5, 11, 13, 15 and 19 have been amended, and claims 12, 14, and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 1-11, 13, 15, and 17-21 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:**

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because rejected claims have been canceled, because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1, 5, 11, 13, 15 and 19 places this application into condition for allowance, and because the amendments of the claims should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:**

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 11-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As part of this rejection, the Office Action suggests that the disclosure "fails to clearly define the imaginary circle on which the fixed positions of the ends of the wires are to be located." Responsively, applicants note that the specification has been amended to specify that the imaginary circle C, having a radius r and the center P, is drawn so as to be substantially vertical with respect to a horizontal surface of a disc above which the blade 20 is supported and substantially parallel with interior surfaces of the

holder 50 and the blade 20. In addition, the specification now states that the fixed positions of the all wires W1-W6 appear, to a hypothetical observer positioned along a line extending through a center of the blade 20 and the holder 50, to be located on a circumference of the imaginary circle C. Therefore, it is believed that the concerns of the Examiner, expressed in the Office Action, should be alleviated.

In addition, regarding the Examiner's suggestion that "the plurality of elastic support members" has no disclosed support when the "plurality is taken to be "four" or "two" pairs, it is also noted that the rejected claims have been amended to specifically recite that the elastic members are grouped into at least three pairs. Thus, the rejections are believed to be overcome as to the allegation that there is no support for "two" pairs of elastic support members. As to the allegation that there is no support for "four" pairs of support members, applicants respectfully assert that the allegation has no basis in fact and request that the Examiner provide an explanation as to how he arrived at that conclusion.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 3, 4, 8-10, 17, 18, 20 and 21 have been allowed.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 3/2/96

By:   
Howard I. Levy  
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye St., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510